

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 13 2005

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET AND  
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

The documents accompanying this telecopy transmission contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is legally protected. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this telecopied information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this telecopy in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (collect) to arrange for return of the telecopied documents to us.

TO: U.S. Patent Office  
Central Facsimile  
Processing Facility  
MAIL STOP AMENDMENT

FROM: Daniel F. Nesbitt  
Hasse & Nesbitt LLC

PHONE: (703) 308-1202

PHONE: (513) 229-0383

FAX: (571) 273-8300

FAX: (513) 229-0683

\*\*\*\*\*  
I, Elaine Willig, hereby certify that the below identified  
correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United  
States Patent and Trademark Office on October 13, 2005.

Signature: Elaine Willig  
\*\*\*\*\*

Pages being transmitted:

Total No. of Pages including this cover letter: 3

1. Response to Restriction Requirement (2  
pages)

Application No.: 10/708,658

Filed: March 17, 2004

Inventor: Herdman

Attorney Docket No.: EZL-001M

COMMENTS:

Attorney Docket No. EZL-001M

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of :  
Rodrick A. HERDMAN : Confirmation No. 2657  
Serial No. 10/708,658 : Group Art Unit 3676  
Filed March 17, 2004 : Examiner GALL, Lloyd A.  
RAPID-CHANGE LOCK :

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 13 2005

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The primary examiner issued a restriction requirement on June 10, 2005, restricting the claims into two inventions: Group I, claim 1-8, drawn to a stretching device, and Group II, drawn to a kit comprising the stretching device.

**Restriction Requirement**

Applicant has provisionally elected with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-4, 6-15, 22, 23 and 44-67, drawn to a changeable lock assembly. Claims 24, 25, 27 and 28 to Group II, drawn to a method of reprogramming a lock, are withdrawn.

**Traverse of Restriction Requirement**

The examiner states that the inventions are distinct because either or both of the following are true:

- (A) the process of using as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product;  
and  
(B) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process.

Application No. 10/708,658  
Amendment date 10/05  
Reply to Office Action of 09/20/05

The Examiner gives as an example that the product can be used with a materially different process, such as inserting the "third" user key in claim 24 without using a second key.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement.

First, the Rules require that the other process or other product be "materially different".

The example provided by the Examiner is not "materially" different. In fact, the Examiner's example is described in Applicants specification at para 187, 8th sentence ("Using any key of the subset that is configured to displace one or more additional change balls than the current number and configuration of change balls 56 that are displaced, will change the corresponding configuration of driver 20, tumbler 22, and change ball 56 to match that key.")

Furthermore, in Applicant's process claim 24, the examiner's "third" key (presumably, a third key in a series of user keys) would become the second key of the claim, and some "fourth" key of the series of keys would be provided as the third key of the claim to displace one additional change member and replace the "third" user key.

Therefore, Applicant contends that the apparatus and process for use claim can not be practiced in materially different ways, such that the Examiner's restriction requirement is improper. Applicant requests withdrawal of the restriction requirement, and a prompt allowance of all claims.

### Conclusion

Applicants request withdrawal of the restriction requirement with respect to the invention of claims 24, 25, 27 and 28, and a prompt allowance of all claims.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR: Rodrick A. HERDMAN

By



Daniel F. Nesbitt  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33,746  
(513) 229-0383  
Customer No. 26868

October 13, 2005